

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and claims 18-22 are now pending in the application upon admission of new claims 18-22. Support for new claims 18-22 is found in the application and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 have been amended and claims 8 and 17 have been cancelled. Bases for the amendments are found throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

NEW CLAIMS 18-22

Applicant has added new claims 18-22. New claims 18-22 are supported by the application as originally filed such as at least in Figs. 1-3 and 5 and paragraphs [0054] – [0057]. Claims 18-22 provide additional novel features that are not taught or rendered obvious by the collective art of record.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to. The recitation to “inking unit” in claims 4 and 12 has been eliminated to render this objection moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 2-11 and 12-17 stand objected to for various informalities. Applicant has amended claims 2-7 and 9-16 as suggested by the Examiner to correct the identified

informalities. Additionally, Applicant has removed the word “that” in claim 6 which appears to be the typographical error identified by the Examiner. Applicant has also amended claims 6 and 10 to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 8 has been cancelled rendering the objection to this claim moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that claims 8 and 17 have been cancelled and the phrase “a structure method” has been removed from claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by LaBelle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6694872). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A method for the production of print products by combining various immediately successive processing methods, the method comprising the steps of:

coating the print products to be produced with a film at predetermined positions according to a film print processing method in one method step comprising:

partially coating said print products with a thin adhesive layer;

providing a transfer film having at least three layers, namely, a carrier foil, a parting layer and a transfer layer;

removing said transfer layer from said carrier foil and transferring it at least partially to said print products with a transfer or printing unit, wherein said transfer layer adheres to the print products; and

providing an embossing and/or a structure according to an embossing and/or a structure processing method in a further method step, wherein the printed products to be produced successively undergo the steps of the method without intermediate storage.

LaBelle relates to a rotary micro-embosser operatively coupled inline with a rotary laminator, a rotary printer, a rotary diecutter, or another web processing device to process a continuous web. A sandwich layer, which consists of a reflective layer (114) bonded to a transparent plastic layer (112) is first subjected to micro-embossing by a micro-embosser (202) and then a paper layer (117a) of a backing web (117) is adhered to the reflective layer (114) using a layer (117d).

The method according to LaBelle differs from the amended claim 1 by the method steps of partially coating print products with a thin adhesive layer; providing a transfer film having at least three layers, namely a carrier foil, a parting layer and a transfer layer; and removing said transfer layer from said carrier foil and transferring it at least partially to said print products with a transfer or printing unit. LaBelle, on the other hand, fails to disclose providing a transfer film having a transfer layer which is to be adhered to the print products. LaBelle teaches a 3-layer backing web (117) where all three layers are attached to a dual layer transparent plastic layer (112) and reflective layer (114). Only after manufacture may the release backing layer (117c) be separated

from layer (117b). (See Col. 4, Ins. 10-28). Thus, LaBelle fails to anticipate each and every element of amended claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Castleton (Pub. No. WO 02/34521). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claim 1, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended as discussed above. Castleton discloses a method for providing a web (10) with a UV activated adhesive (11) to a first UV activation stage (16). The web (10), along with a foil web (26) having a carrier layer and a foil layer, is passed through a nip (20,22). The foil web (26) is transferred to the web (10). A die (200) embosses patterns into the surface of the foil, at the same time as the foil (15) is picked up by and adhered to the tacky adhesive (11). (See page 8, lines 22-26). The web (10) then passes through a second UV station (36).

Castleton fails to disclose providing a transfer film having at least three layers, namely a carrier foil, a parting layer and a transfer layer. Castleton describes a two-layer foil web (26) consisting of a carrier layer and a foil layer (page 6, Ins. 23-24). Castleton also fails to disclose coating print products to be produced...providing an embossing and/or structure...wherein the printed products to be produced successively undergo the steps of the method. In contrast, Castleton discloses a method for simultaneously providing a web (10) with a foil (15) and an embossing (see page 8, Ins. 22-26, Fig. 5). Castleton does not, for example, show applying a foil layer to a web and

then emboss the web in a successive step. Thus, Applicant submits that Castleton fails to anticipate each and every element of amended claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-5, 6, 10-13 and 16 respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-8 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaBelle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6694872) in view of Lacey (U.S. Pat. No. 5932150). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lacey discloses a method for impressing a diffraction image into an oriented polymeric film wherein, after orientation of the film, the temperature of the film is raised to a desired annealing temperature, the film temperature being continuously maintained above room temperature while a diffraction pattern is embossed directly into the surface of the film.

In regard to claim 7, Lacey produces a transfer film as its final product (Col. 7, lns. 37-38). Thus, Lacey fails to teach or describe stretching an already supplied transfer film since the transfer film does not exist until the end of the process. Furthermore, assuming, *arguendo*, that the “transfer film” of Lacey exists throughout the entire process, Lacey provides no teaching or motivation to stretch a transfer film again when it is run through the machine of LaBelle (since the Lacey film has already been stretched).

Applicant notes that claim 8 has been cancelled. The Examiner's rejection of claim 8 should now be moot in light of the foregoing cancellation.

In regard to claim 14, Lacey fails to teach or suggest a film transfer device having at least one expander roller. In fact, Lacey fails to even disclose a film transfer device as presently claimed. Lacey shows a single film layer (12) throughout the entire apparatus and is wholly absent of a film transfer device transferring anything to film layer (12).

In regard to claim 15, Lacey fails to teach or suggest an expander roller being shorter than the width of a film transfer device. As noted above, Lacey wholly fails to teach a film transfer device as presently claimed. The Examiner has cited (30) as a film transfer device. However, Applicant notes that (30) is a rotating die roller embossing a pattern into the surface (24) of film (12) (Col. 7, Ins. 9-10).

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaBelle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6694872) in view of Lappe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5565054). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 9 is dependent from claim 1. As Applicant believes amended claim 1 contains allowable subject matter, claim 9 should also be in condition for allowance.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaBelle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6694872) in view of Huck (U.S. Pat. No. 2699941). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 17 has been cancelled. The Examiner's rejection of claim 17 should now be moot in light of the foregoing cancellation.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that LaBelle, alone or in combination with Lacey, Lappe or Huck, fails to teach or suggest every element of independent claim 1 or its dependent claims 7, 9, and 14-15. Furthermore, Lacey, Lappe and Huck, whether considered independently or as combined, also fail to account for the deficiencies of either LaBelle or Castleton discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2009

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/LMB/jd